

- a certain long-chain aliphatic polyester polyol (A) (“claim 1’s aliphatic polyester polyol”);
- a certain aliphatic polyether polyol (B); and
- a certain aromatic polyester polyol (CI).

- a polyester polyol prepared by reacting a diol with an aromatic diacid and optionally also with co-monomer diacid(s) (“Li’s main polyol”).³

- a crystalline polyester polyol, including the reaction product of an aliphatic diol and an aliphatic diacid⁵ (“Li’s supplemental crystalline aliphatic polyester polyol”);
- a flexible polyol, including a polyether polyol⁶; and
- an amorphous polyester polyol, including the reaction product of a diol and a diacid such as isophthalic acid or terephthalic acid (“Li’s supplemental amorphous polyester polyol”).⁷

⁷ Li, column 5, lines 18-19 and 23-25.

Takahashi's disclosures, one of ordinary skill in the art would have simply added a crystalline aliphatic polyester polyol to Li's polyol mixture as taught by Li itself, rather than replacing "Li's main polyol" altogether, in order to improve adhesion.

At least for this reason, Li taken with Degussa and in combination with Takahashi would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Li taken with Degussa and in view of Takahashi does not render claim 1 obvious, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 6-10 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that at least for the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Li taken with Degussa and in view of Takahashi does not render these claims obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 2, 3, and 6-10 be withdrawn.

IV. Rejections of Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Li when taken with Degussa and in view of Takahashi and further in view of United States Patent No. 4,312,973 to Critchfield et al. ("Critchfield"). The Examiner contends that Li taken with Degussa and in combination with Takahashi and Critchfield renders claims 4 and 5 obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. The rejections of claims 4 and 5 are predicated on the Examiner's assertion that Li taken with Degussa and in view of Takahashi teaches the subject matter of claim 1.¹⁴ As discussed above, however, that is not the case.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Critchfield, either alone or in combination with Li taken with Degussa and Takahashi, does not disclose the subject matter of claim 1.

¹⁴ Non-Final Office Action dated May 28, 2008, page 4, lines 19-20.

CONCLUSION